

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Heiney et al.

Application No.: 10/783,851

Group No.: 2854

Filed: 20 February 2004

Examiner: W. H. Hamdan

Title: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR PERFORMING LARGE SCALE  
DISTRIBUTED PRINTING USING A RELATIONAL DATABASE

**TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

*Applicant submits this telephone interview summary to meet the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b), and according to the requirements listed in MPEP § 713.04.*

Date/Type of Interview: telephone interview conducted on 7 August 2006

Examiner: W. Hamdan

Name of Applicant's attorney: M. Gratton

Exhibits shown or demonstrations conducted: None

Claims discussed: 1, 12 and 15

Prior art discussed: Stuart (United States Patent Number 6,466,935).

General thrust of Examiner's arguments: see below

General thrust of Applicant's arguments: see below

Agreement reached and general nature of the agreement: see below

Proposed amendments: see below

Other pertinent matters:

Applicant's undersigned attorney and the Examiner discussed various aspects of the system in the rejected claims. The Examiner expressed concern with the meaning of the hierarchical name determining location information. Applicants proposed to amend claims 1, 12 and 15 to clarify that the hierarchical name of the print objects identify a location of the print object in the enterprise.

The Examiner further expressed concern regarding the clarity of "print objects" as used in claims 1, 12 and 15. Applicants proposed amending claims 1, 12 and 15 to include that a portion of the print objects correspond to the plurality of printers, and that the print objects corresponding to the plurality of printers include a plurality of attributes for each of the plurality of printers. These recitations were previously presented in claims 2 and 3.

The Examiner has further expressed concern with the clarity of "factors" used to schedule the print jobs. Applicants proposed amending claims 1, 12 and 15 to recite that one of the factors used for scheduling is the hierarchical name of the plurality of print objects, and that another factor includes the authorized users of at least one of the plurality of printers.

Broad agreement was reached between the undersigned attorney and the Examiner regarding these three issues. These proposed amendments have been incorporated into the attached Amendment.

Date: 8 August 2006



---

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Max Gratton, Reg. No. 56,541  
Attorney for Applicant and Assignee  
Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP  
Telephone: (303) 786-7687  
Facsimile: (303) 786-7691